DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 223 FL 016 152

AUTHOR Faerch, Claus; Kasper, Gabriele
TITLE Phatic, Metalingual and Metacommunicative Functions in Discourse: Gambits and Repairs.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 36p.; In: Enkvist, Nils Erik, Ed. Impromptu Speech: A Symposium. Papers Contributed to a Symposium on Problems in the Linguistic Study of Impromptu Speech (Abo, Finland, November 20-22, 1981); see FL 016 148.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; Connected Discourse; *Discourse Analysis; Interaction; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Mutual Intelligibility; Native Speakers; *Oral Language; Psycholinguistics; *Research Methodology; Second Language Learning; *Speech Acts; *Spontaneous Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Metacommunication; *Spontaneous Speech

ABSTRACT

The need for an analytical approach to the study of phatic, metalingual, and metacommunicative functions in asymmetrical communicative situations (between native speakers and language learners) is discussed. The study presents theoretical frameworks for gambits and repairs, the linguistic phenomena that primarily serve those functions, and discusses their interrelationship. It outlines hypotheses about repair work in interactions between native speakers and learners at different proficiency levels, and argues that the discourse-analytical approach should be broadened to include a psycholinguistic dimension in order to adequately explain communicative behavior. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277223

PHATIC, METALINGUAL AND METACOMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS IN DISCOURSE: GAMBITS & REPAIRS

Claus Faerch
University of Copenhagen

Gabriele Kasper
University of Aarhus

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Enkvist

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 016 152

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Claus Faerch
University of Copenhagen

Gabriele Kasper
University of Aarhus

Phatic, metalingual and metacommunicative functions in discourse: Gambits and Repairs

1. Introduction

Abstract. The need for realizing phatic, metalingual and metacommunicative functions is particularly strong in communicative situations where relevant linguistic knowledge is asymmetrically distributed, as is notably the case in interactions between native speakers and language learners. Theoretical frameworks for the linguistic phenomena which primarily serve those functions, viz. gambits and repairs, are presented, and their interrelationship is discussed. On the basis of these considerations and a small set of conversational data, hypotheses about repair work in interactions between native speakers and learners at different proficiency levels are formulated. It is finally argued that the discourse-analytical approach should be broadened to include a psycholinguistic dimension, which seems necessary if one aims at explaining communicative behaviour.

As a point of departure for this article, let us try to imagine what an interaction would be like between two idealized native speakers, Mr Noam and Mr Chomsky, adhering completely to the Gricean maxims of communication within a Habermasian universe of discourse: Both participants would have equal access to the linguistic code, although their knowledge of the world might differ (though not in any basic respects). The speaker would formulate himself in a way which at the same time would express his communicative intentions in a maximally economic way and enable his interlocutor unambiguously and with ease to reconstruct his intention. The 'messages' would be 'transmitted' between the participants without being distorted by any 'noise'. In this utopian situation, communication could develop in a straight line towards whatever illocutionary and propositional goals have been established by the participants.

Unfortunately, real-life communication is very different from this. One way of tackling this sad state of affairs is to transfer the distinction between a *langue* and a *parole* level to communication analysis and see the various communicative manifestations as somehow 'distorted' relative to models of communication based on the Holy Trinity of Chomsky, Grice and Habermas.

Another approach, the one we adopt in this paper, is to acknowledge that communication is very often **asymmetric** and continually creates problems of various sorts that have to be solved. Speakers may have wrong expectations about their interlocutors' linguistic knowledge or knowledge of the world. Speakers get misunderstood – or do not say exactly what they intended because of being excited or drunk or tired. Hearers do not know whether their reconstruction of the speaker's communicative intention is correct because they did not hear everything that was said or because they cannot relate what was said to the given context. In real-life communication, there is a constant need for speakers both to self-monitor their own speech production and to monitor the reaction of their interlocutors. There is a need for listeners to ensure that their interpretation of the speaker's communicative intention in fact matches what he wanted to say. And occasionally, there is a need for both speakers and listeners to solve problems as they crop up when finding ways of conveying communicative intentions or clarifying what turns out to be a misunderstanding or a lack of understanding. Language provides means for performing these various functions which are essential for verbal interaction, referred to as phatic, metalingual and metacommunicative. Before we go into a discussion of two specific examples of these, viz. gambits and repairs, let us indulge in some metalingual activity and clarify how we use these three terms.

In the Jakobsonian model of communicative functions (1960), a distinction is observed between the phatic and the metalingual function. Following Malinowski, Jakobson attributes a predominantly **phatic** function to a message if it serves 'to establish, to prolong, or to discontinue communication, to check whether the channel works (...), to attract the attention of the interlocutor or to confirm his continued attention' (1960:355). The **metalingual** function operates 'whenever the addresser and/or the addressee need to check up whether they use the same code' (356). The latter definition needs clarification on two points: (1) In Jakobson's terms, the metalingual function is interactionally defined: it is in focus in the case of shared communication problems due to differences in the availability of the code used. While this is no doubt an important aspect, it does not seem to be the only way in which metalingual activity is performed: it can also address itself to code problems the speaker experiences in formulating himself, manifesting itself in the correction of speech errors, the substitution of a chosen lexical item by another

one which the speaker feels is more appropriate in terms of his intended meaning, and so forth. The metalingual function should therefore be understood to include code-directed activity which may be either interactional or speaker-oriented. (2) The metalingual function is related to, but should not be confused with what Watzlawick/Beavin/Jackson (1967) refer to as the **metacommunicative** function. This function indicates how the referential meaning of a message is to be interpreted. According to these authors, it is identical with the relational aspect of communication (1967). The difference between the metalingual and the metacommunicative function is that in the first case, the verbal activity is directed towards formal and semantic aspects of the code, e.g. 'I've knowed known her for years',' what does "obfuscate" mean'. In the second case, on the other hand, the verbal activity addresses itself to the illocutionary dimension, i.e. to the pragmatic level: it indicates what the speaker means by what he is saying ('I'm only joking', 'this is an order'), or how the hearer interprets what the speaker has said ('is this a reproach or what?'). In other words, the metalingual function operates when the focus is on the 'objective' properties of the code, whereas the metacommunicative function relates to the speaker's subjective intentions or the hearer's subjective interpretation thereof when using the code. Although there will be cases of overlap between the metalingual and the metacommunicative function, a distinction along the lines suggested seems both theoretically and empirically feasible.

Most types of verbal activities contain the phatic, the metalingual and the metacommunicative function **implicitly**: in responding to his interlocutor's preceding move in a cohesive and coherent manner, a speaker performs the phatic function in 'keeping the channel open', i.e. he maintains and futhers the discourse. In choosing acceptable and appropriate linguistic means, the speaker – most frequently without being aware of doing so – observes metalingual aspects. In using illocutionary force indicating devices (e.g. modal particles), a speaker informs his hearer about the illocutionary act he intends to perform by uttering the locution. In this paper, however, we shall concentrate on verbal activity whose **exclusive** or **predominant** function is phatic, metalingual or metacommunicative (cf. also the distinction proposed by Heritage 1981 between 'embedded' and 'exposed' 'displays of understanding').

2. Gambits

The class of linguistic phenomena which have an exclusively or predominantly **phatic** function has been referred to as **gambits**, among others by Edmondson (1977), House (1980), Edmondson/House (1981), and Faerch/Kasper (in press). In the present discussion we shall use the conceptual framework established in our previous article.

The primary function of gambits is to maintain and regulate discourse. By **maintaining discourse** is meant the establishment of coherence either between turns of speech or within turns of speech. By **regulating discourse** is meant the distribution of turns at speech among the discourse participants in terms of uptaking, turntaking, turnkeeping, turngiving, and the marking of discourse boundaries. These discourse-regulating functions will be further specified below, and the types of gambits by means of which they can be performed will be detailed (cf. Edmondson 1977, Edmondson/House 1981).

Uptaking is performed by a present hearer in order to signal to the present speaker that the channel is still open and that the speaker's message is being taken in. It indicates furthermore that the present hearer makes no claim on getting the floor but reinforces the current distribution of discourse roles between the participants. The types of gambits by means of which uptaking can be realized are (1) the receipt, (2) the go-on, (3) the exclaim. In using them, the hearer establishes coherence with the speaker's ongoing speech activity.

(1) The receipt is the most neutral signal a hearer can use in order to indicate that he is following the present speaker's contribution. It can either have the function of an attention signal (*mm, uhu*), or it can express understanding of (*I see (what you mean)*) or even agreement to the interlocutor's speech act (*you're right, that's true*). The first two functions are sometimes realized by a re-present, i.e. an utterance by means of which the speaker repeats to himself a part or the whole of what has just been communicated to him (S: 'We're going to Poona for a holiday next month'. – H: 'Poona oh yeah').

(2) The **go-on** is a special case of a receipt whereby the present hearer signals to the present speaker that he is listening and that he wants the speaker to keep his turn (*yes, mm*).

(3) The **exclaim** is a special case of a receipt which is marked for an expressive function, thereby indicating its user's emotive reaction to (a part of) his interlocutor's utterance. Although the exclaim does not differ from a receipt in terms of its discourse functions, it seems desirable to distinguish between these two gambits as they are realized by different classes of tokens, viz. either by a receipt carrying an emphatic marker (*oh, no*), or by elements which function regularly as 'interjections' (*good grief, what*).

Turntaking takes place when the current distribution of discourse roles is reversed in that a former hearer takes over the speaking role and a former speaker assumes a hearer's part. A former hearer can signal his intention of taking a turn by means of the following gambits:

The **starter** functions as a preliminary to a following utterance, indicating that its user is going to say something (*well, er, em*). It is unique as a gambit type in that it ties up neither with the interlocutor's nor with the present speaker's speech activity, i.e. it has no coherence function. By contrast, other turntaking gambits establish coherence between the present and the former speaker's contribution. These are the **receipt** and the **exclaim** (see above), which can also be used in a turntaking function. Moreover, **conjunctions** can be employed as turntakers, due to the fact that they normally occur clause-initially (*but, and, or*). As their primary function, however, is that of creating cohesion in texts by expressing how what follows the conjunction relates to what precedes, its discourse-regulating function as a turntaker is of secondary status.

Turnkeeping is an attempt by the present speaker to keep the floor, which becomes particularly relevant at a possible completion point in the speaker's turn. It can be performed by (1) an underscorer, (2) an aside, (3) a cajoler, (4) a hesitator, or by a conjunction.

(1) An **underscorer** serves to focus the interlocutor's attention to a point being made by the present speaker ('the point/thing is').

(2) An **aside** functions to inform the interlocutor about what the present speaker is doing while he is **not** addressing himself to the present hearer

(S1. 'can I see you about those references tomorrow' /S2: 'tomorrow... **let me see**...I've got appointments all morning...how about 2 o'clock').

(3, 4) Similar to conjunctions, cajolers and hesitators do not function as gambits primarily: the basic function of the **cajoler** is interpersonal in that it 'serves to establish, increase, or indeed restore harmony between the two conversational partners' (Edmondson/House 1981: 75) (*you know, you see, I mean, actually*). **Hesitators** are first and foremost devices used by a speaker in order to gain time for planning his speech, and may be interpreted by the hearer as problem-indicators (*er, erm*). When used at a possible completion point, they can however fulfill a turnkeeping function.

Turngiving is performed when the present speaker signals to the present hearer that he has finished his turn and wants the hearer to take the floor. The gambit which operates as a turngiver is the **appealer**: it elicits a response from the hearer to what the speaker has just said (tag question, *uh, okay*). However, appealers have a turngiving function only in turn-final position. When used turn-internally, their function is to elicit an uptaker from the present hearer while the present speaker keeps his turn.

Marking signals boundaries in discourse, e.g. between the opening and core phase, between the core and the closing phase, and between different discourse topics. This function is carried out by the marker, which either indicates the completion of an ongoing discourse topic or phase (*okay, good*), or the opening of a next discourse topic or phase (*well now, by the way*).

It should be mentioned that the use of gambits is often accompanied by discourse-regulating signals at the nonverbal level, which can also replace the verbal signals completely. In his analysis of dyadic face-to-face interactions, Duncan (1974) observed, for instance, that 'head nod' as a nonverbal uptaker ('auditor back channel signal') occurred with almost identical frequency as the most frequent verbal uptaker, the 'u-hum signal'.

Of the discourse-regulating functions introduced above, we shall now discuss uptaking in some more detail. In so doing, we hope to identify some aspects of the relationship between the phatic function on the one hand and the metalingual and metacommunicative function on the other hand.

Within uptaking, various subfunctions can be distinguished, which can be glossed as follows:

(a) 'I'm listening': indication of the hearer's attention to the speaker's verbal activity
(b) 'I can hear what you're saying': indication of the speaker's verbal activity being physically accessible to the nearer (*mm, uhu*)
(c) 'I understand what you're saying': indication of the present hearer's assigning meaning to the speaker's utterance (*mm, uhu, I see, yeah*)
(d) 'I agree to what you're saying': indication of agreement with the present speaker's message (*that's right, sure*)
(e) 'I react with surprise/doubt/anger... to what you're saying': indication of the hearer's emotive reaction to the speaker's message (*really, oh no, how splendid*).

Whereas the subfunctions (c), (d) and (e) can easily be identified in many types of verbal interaction, (a) and (b) seem to be theoretical possibilities rather than empirically observable distinctions. However, attention signals which indicate nothing but the hearer's readiness to 'tune in' to his interlocutor (a) are used in telephone conversations when there is noise in the channel ('hello' indicating 'I'm (here and) listening but I can't hear you'), as a response to a summons in the first exchange of an encounter (S1: 'Excuse me professor Flabberwacker' – S2: 'yes'), or in fact as an initiating opening move in service or counselling encounters where the mere entering of a customer/client into the setting calls for signalling availability to talk by the participant whose service is requested ('yes'). Function (b) is in focus when a learner acknowledges the speaker's verbal activity without however receiving the message – this can either be due to the learner's inattentiveness ('sorry I wasn't listening – what are you saying?'), or to his inability to assign meaning to the speaker's utterance ('I heard what you said but I didn't understand it'). In both cases, the learner might use uptaking signals which from his point of view relate to his reception of a stretch of sounds uttered by the speaker only, whereas the speaker might mistakenly interpret them as signalling understanding. If we then assume that the suggested distinctions can manifest themselves under certain conditions, we can characterize their relationships as follows:

By expressing functions (a) and (b), the hearer topicalizes the psychological and physical preconditions for understanding, without however signalling understanding itself. Functions (d) and (e), on the other hand, while implying understanding, are concerned with the hearer's cognitive or emotive attitude towards the speaker's message. Only function (c) has to do with the present hearer's comprehension, which we paraphrased as 'assigning meaning to the speaker's utterance'. It presupposes that the speaker uses a code which is receptively available to the hearer. According to our definitions proposed above, signalling understanding as a subfunction of uptaking can therefore be characterized as having both a phatic and a metalingual function.

In terms of the interpersonal relationship holding between discourse participants, uptaking can be characterized as being in accordance with the interactional principle of face-saving (see Goffman 1967, Brown/Levinson 1978): by actively supporting the present speaker's contributions, the hearer at the same time conveys the acceptance of the speaker as a co-participant whose social needs are respected (cf Edmondson/House 1981: 74).

Signalling understanding is fundamental to all conversation. Its primary function is to ensure the speaker that he can proceed without having to clarify or correct what he said. Closely related to this function is the signalling of non-understanding, which is typically expressed in two ways: **indirectly** by lack of uptaking or 'a hearer's silence', **directly** by means of an uptaking gambit in co-occurrence with paralinguistic signals like rising or level intonation and various extra-linguistic indications, which in the last resort determine whether the uptaker signals understanding or the opposite. As the signalling of non-understanding will normally force the speaker to initiate a repair-sequence (see below)[1], we here get into the borderline area between gambits and repairs, to be further explored later in the article.

3. Repair work

Repair as the verbal activity whose predominant function is metalingual or metacommunicative (cf the discussion above) has been of central interest in

[1] This relationship between uptaking gambits and repairs has been implicitly suggested by Duncan (1974), who subsumes 'request for clarification' under his five types of 'auditor back-channel signals', and has been explicitly pointed out by Edmondson/House 1981: 62f., 73, 216.

ethnomethodological research. Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks (1977) established a framework for the analysis of repair which we shall take as a starting-point for our discussion of this phenomenon.

Unfortunately Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks do not offer a definition of repair. However, they do emphasize that the notion is to be understood as including, though not as identical with, corrections (1977: 363). Furthermore, according to their conceptual framework, a repair is not necessarily a replacement of one item by another – which means that 'word-searches' are included under repairs. Consequently, the 'trouble source' (or the 'repairable') need not show in the performance, although this is the case in most of the examples discussed in the article: the trouble source is an utterance or a part thereof which is experienced as problematic by at least one of the participants: the speaker might feel there to be a mismatch between what he said and what he intended to say, and the hearer might not be able to assign meaning to (a part of) the speaker's utterance, or he might be in doubt about the meaning he assigned to it. The metalingual and metacommunicative activity addressed to removing the trouble source is referred to as repair work.

In analysing how participants perform repairs structurally, Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks specify four related repair patterns, which can be distinguished according to three criteria: (a) who is responsible for the repairable, (b) who initiates the repair, (c) who carries out the repair.

According to these criteria, repairs can have the following structure:

(1) Self-initiated self-(completed) repair: the participant responsible for the trouble source initiates and completes the repair himself ('She wants to study archeology – anthropology')

(2) Other-initiated self-(completed) repair: the recipient identifies a trouble source and initiates a repair which is carried out by the participant responsible for the trouble source (S1: 'She wants to study archeology.' – S2: 'archeology' – S1: 'nonsense anthropology')

(3) Self-initiated other-(completed) repair: the participant responsible for the trouble source initiates a repair which is carried out by the recipient (S1: 'Sche wants to study archeology – or was it anthropology' – S2: 'anthropology I think')

(4) Other-initiated other-(completed) repair: the recipient identifies a trouble source and repairs on it (S1: 'She wants to study archeology' – S2: 'anthropology you mean').

Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks observe that interactants do not choose either of these repair patterns arbitrarily but prefer self-initiated to other-initiated repair and self-completed to other-completed repair, which means that there is a strong preference for self-initiated, other-completed repairs. At a descriptive linguistic level, this reflects the structural aspects of discourse in that the occasion for self-repair occurs before the occasion for other-repair. At a socio-psychological level, Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks offer no explanation for the preference for self-repairs over other-repairs, except that they observe that other-repairs tend to be treated by the speaker as disagreement, and that other-'correction' seems to serve an important function in the socialization process 'for dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires, for its routine operation, that they be adequate self-monitors and self-correctors as a condition for competence' (1977: 381). It seems fairly obvious that the preference for self-repair reflects the principle of face-saving (see above): an unsuccessful utterance may well be experienced as face-threatening by its producer, where self-repair then allows for restoring face. The identification and removal of a trouble source by the co-participant, on the other hand, will cast doubt on the trouble source producer's abilities as a communicator to a more serious extent as the trouble source becomes 'public' and a case for interactional treatment.

There are a number of points that need clarification in connection with the Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks description of repairs – especially so when applying it to highly asymmetric types of interaction like conversations between learners and native speakers. In the following, we address ourselves to four areas:

(a) the nature of the trouble source, i.e. the relationship between repairs and 'corrections' and the question of 'replacement'
(b) the relationship between the different types of repair sequences and uptaking
(c) the relationship between self-initiated self-completed and self-initiated other-completed repairs

CORRECTION

The sentence on p. 80 beginning on line 4 should read:

Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks observe that interactants do not choose either of these repair patterns arbitrarily but prefer self-initiated to other-initiated repair and self-completed to other-completed repair, which means that there is a strong preference for self-initiated, self-completed repairs at the expense of other-initiated, other-completed repairs. At a descriptive linguistic level, this -----

(d) the completion of repairs, in particular the question of follow-up moves subsequent to the repair sequence.

(a) Repair, replacement and communication strategy

As we mentioned above, Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks include in their notion of repair cases in which the trouble source is not represented in the performance, i.e. 'replacement' is no prerequisite for repairs. This brings repairs close to 'communication strategies' if the latter are understood broadly as attempts to solve problems in communication. Neither Schwartz (1980) nor Gaskill (1980) observes any distinction between repairs and communication strategies in their respective studies of repairs in interlanguage communication, whereas Tarone (1980) explicitly argues that there is an **overlap** between communication strategies and repairs in the area of repairs designed 'to better transmit intended meaning', but that repairs of **formal** aspects of language fall outside the area of communication strategies. We agree with Tarone that repairs and communication strategies are best treated as different classes of phenomena with some overlap between them, but the criterion we would adopt in order to distinguish between the two categories differs significantly from Tarone's criterion ('form' versus 'meaning').

We consider **repair sequences** part of discourse analysis, necessary in order to describe and explain specific structural properties of conversational data. Repair sequences are initiated by the production of what turns out to be a trouble source, i.e. in opposition to Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks we would restrict repair work to 'corrections' (**replacements** of a with b). If the speaker experiences a problem in finding the right word and hesitates before coming up with an attempt, this does not in itself constitute a repair sequence in our sense of the term as it does not have any **structural** implications for the discourse.

Communication strategies, on the other hand, are part of a cognitive-interactional description of communication. Communication strategies presuppose conscious awareness of a problem in speech production or reception, and they refer to the participant's various attempts to come to grips with these problems, either on a cooperative or a non-cooperative basis (see further the discussion in Færch/Kasper 1980). As we have shown elsewhere (Færch/

Kasper forthcoming a), communication strategies may be **covert**, i.e. the problem experiencer need not reveal by any 'signals of uncertainty' (ibid.) that he is experiencing a problem. **Overt** communication strategies occur when the problem manifests itself in performance (e.g. as a pause or as a turn-keeping gambit). Whether communication strategies are to be classified as repairs or not at the **discourse** level of description depends exclusively on whether they are solutions to trouble sources expressed directly in the discourse. Thus in the case of 'I found my-er-screwdriver in the basement', 'screwdriver' is the result of a communication strategy though not an instance of a self-repair. Whereas the same word would be a self-repair (in addition to functioning as a communication strategy) in the sentence 'I found my-er-what do you call it – for putting screws into the wall – screwdriver'.

What are the advantages of restricting repairs to replacement? One considerable advantage is that in so doing we avoid the potential vacuousness of saying that speakers experience trouble sources whenever they have to monitor whether their interlocutor will be able to understand a specific structure or part hereof. Predicting the communicative effect of language use and adjusting one's performance accordingly is not an exceptional phenomenon, relevant in connection with foreigner talk only: it occurs in all interactions, though obviously to various degrees. All language use is interactional in this sense, and one gains no insight into specific aspects of communication by advocating this principle[2].

(b) Repair and uptaking

In conversation, speakers constantly monitor their own speech production. They compare the speech segments they produce with their cognitive plans, and they follow the reactions of their interlocutor(s). We refer to the

[2] For the same reason, we do not find Schwartz' observation that self-repairs are instances of 'negotiated interaction' (1980: 141) nor Tarone's insisting on all communication strategies being interactional (1980) very revealing. They are either highly problematic, given any limited definition of 'interactional' (e.g. in discourse terms), or trivial.

first-mentioned type of monitoring as 'self-monitoring' and to the last-mentioned type as 'other-monitoring'.

Self-monitoring is the mechanism for detecting slips and errors, to be self-corrected. There is an obvious and close link between self-monitoring as it occurs in all types of conversation and monitoring in Krashen's sense (see e.g. Krashen 1981). Other-monitoring may reveal lack of understanding on the part of the hearer(s) and cause the speaker to repair his utterance or part of it. If the hearer's lack of understanding is not signalled explicitly by a repair request (leading to an other-initiated repair sequence), we have to do with a situation which is difficult to fit into the model established by Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks: self-initiation of repairs as a result of other-monitoring. We differentiate between two types of self-initiated repair sequences: self-initiated repair as a result of self-monitoring, and self-initiated repair as a result of other-monitoring.

By introducing the notion of other-monitoring and relating it to self-initiation of repair we can add another piece to our explanation of the observable preference for self-correction: there are *two* systems available to the hearer in order to bring about a repair sequence. *During* a turn at speech, the hearer can bring about a repair sequence by changing his uptaking patterns, or by withholding an uptaking gambit, by stopping his head nods, or by means of gaze combined with a frown. This system comes out of operation at turn-taking (although it often functions past the turn-completion point, cf the observation in Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks that a pause at the turn-taking point often results in a self-initiated repair). The first system then gives way to the system described by Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks, according to which the hearer has to request a repair explicitly in order to initiate a repair sequence. Although we cannot support this empirically we believe that many apparently self-initiated repairs are in *effect* triggered off by hearer's lack of uptaking.

The importance of the uptaking function for interaction is borne out by the fact that one of the main functions of appeals (see above) is to elicit uptaking ('can you hear me?', 'do you understand?' or simply a tag-question). Speakers therefore have two possibilities for dealing with lack of uptaking: (1) interpret it as an indirect signal that self-repair is needed; (2) appeal for uptaking. It would be interesting to know what governs the speaker's selection of one of these rather than the other as a reaction to lack of uptaking. Unfortunately, we have nothing to offer on this question.

(c) Self-initiated self-completed or self-initiated other-completed repairs

According to Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks, most self-initiated repairs yield self-completion (1977: 369, 377). It is very difficult from the article to obtain an impression of the occurrence of self-initiated other-completed repairs, as this type of repair sequence only gets mentioned as a structural possibility but is not discussed.

Self-initiation of repairs is typically accompanied by various 'non-lexical perturbations, e.g. cut offs, sound stretches, *uh*'s, to signal the possibility of repair-initiation immediately following' (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977: 367). If the hearer interprets such signals as 'markers of uncertainty' and, following the cooperative principle of conversation, offers a repair suggestion, the resultant repair sequence is of the type self-initiated other-completed repair. At a descriptive structural level, this is no different from cases in which the speaker explicitly appeals to the hearer for a repair (verbally and/or paralinguistically) (S1. 'I talked to this Mr Cris-er – what's his name' (looks at S2) – S2: 'Christensen you mean'), but there may be significant differences both with respect to intentionality (on the part of the speaker) and with respect to how obliged the hearer feels to offer a repair.

By marking the need for a repair by means of a nonexiplicit appeal (hesitation, gambit or the like), the speaker leaves it open whether he can complete the repair himself or whether his signalling the initiation of repair is an (intentional) indirect appeal. This type of self-initiation may serve a defensive face-saving function (Goffman 1967): if you help me out, fine, but I can manage myself!

As seem from the hearer's point of view, repairing is optional following a non-appealing repair initiator but obligatory following a direct appeal or, put differently, the conditional relevance of an explicitly appealing repair initiator is stronger than the conditional relevance of other repair initiators. This gives us the following possibilities for repair completion following a self-initiation.

(a) - self-initiator ——> self-completion

(b) [+ self-initiator
    - appeal]

(c) + appeal ——> other-completion

It would be interesting to investigate to what extent speakers' preferences for (a), (b) and (c) depend on questions of face-saving and to what extent they depend on the nature of the trouble source (see further the related discussion in connection with communication strategies in Færch/Kasper forthcoming a).

(d) Follow-up moves following repair completion

In his analysis of repair work, Rehbein (1978) points out that in everyday conversation, repair sequences are normally finalized by the 'self': in the case of other-completed repairs, the self confirms the repair by performing a follow-up move. Examples of this can be found in Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks (1977: 365):

A: half the group that we had la:s' term wz there en we jus' playing arou:nd.
B: Uh – fooling around.
A: Eh – yeah...

From a discourse point of view, this means that the participant who is responsible for the trouble source keeps his turn at speech, even in cases of other-repair. Repair sequences are hence structurally organized in such a way that they typically establish loops in the discourse structure without interfering with the turn-taking system.

Rehbein makes the interesting observation that in communication in the foreign language classroom, the general pattern for repair work is upset in the way that it is typically the teacher who finalizes all repair sequences. When a pupil, after having produced a trouble source, self-repairs, this is followed by a follow-up move by the teacher, confirming (or rejecting) the repair. To this should be added that teachers sometimes encourage their pupils to repeat a teacher-repair, in which case the follow-up move has a direct teaching function.

With Rehbein's description of repair work in classroom communication we approach the topic we would like to consider in the second part of this article: uptaking and repair work in a specific type of asymmetric communicative situations, viz. interactions between L2 learners and native speakers.

4. Uptaking and repair-work in interlanguage communication

4.1. Previous studies

While a few studies have been conducted into L2 learners' use of repairs in face-to-face interaction, to be discussed below, we know of only one systematic investigation into the use of uptakers (and other gambits) and their relationship to repairs in learner-native speaker interaction. In her study of German learners of English conversing with English native speakers, Kasper (1981) found that verbal uptakers were used strikingly more frequently by the learners than by the native speakers, and that furthermore the native speakers, in conversing with learners, used uptakers far more often than when interacting with other native speakers. This was interpreted as being due to an increased need for signalling understanding in case of unequal access to the code. Other-initiations of self-repairs occurred considerably more often in the performance of both participants in the learner-native speaker interactions than in the native speaker interactions. However, the learners quite often did not initiate a repair although they evidently had not understood the native speaker's utterance. Again, this can be interpreted in terms of the principle of face-saving: whereas showing that one has understood one's interlocutor's contribution is in line with the notion of face, admitting non-understanding (in particular when felt as being due to one's ignorance) is not, and is therefore likely to be avoided, especially by more advanced learners like the subjects in Kasper's study.

Repairs in learner-native speaker and learner-learner interaction have been analyzed in two studies, Schwartz (1980) and Gaskill (1980). Working with video-recordings of interaction in pairs between learners of English, Schwartz found the same preference for self-repair as described in Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks. Other-repair was restricted and tended to occur when the speaker

made a lexical, syntactic or phonological error. Schwartz interprets this as an indication of the interaction being asymmetric with respect to linguistic competence. In his study of other repairs in learner-native speaker interactions, Gaskill found a similar occurrence of other-repair in connection with formal correction, although this seemed to be a characteristic feature of those native speakers only who were experienced ESL instructors. The following example is quoted by Gaskill:

Hassan: I uh I like Vestern movie (0.2)...
Lew : Western movies uhu.

Gaskill points out the double function of other-repairs like this in the form of restatements: the hearer expresses understanding of the speaker's turn (cf the mentioning of re-presents as uptaking/turntaking gambits above) and at the same time performs a corrective act. Gaskill includes word-searches in his analysis of repairs (cf the discussion of repairs versus communication strategies above, section 3a), and reports that word-searches frequently result in other-repair, which he accounts for by suggesting that 'the search constitutes a kind of correction-invitation format' (136).

The two studies confirm the finding of a preference for self-repair even in interactions between learner-native speaker and learner-learner. But the skewing towards self-repair may be less clear in such situations as error correction and cooperatively enacted problem-solving may result in more other-correction than is the case in more symmetric interactions.

4.2. Hypotheses about repair patterns in learner-native speaker discourse

4.2.0. Empirical basis and procedure

In the studies reported on above, no attempts were made at distinguishing between repair behaviour of learners at different proficiency levels and possible variation in native speakers' repair preferences when conversing with more or less proficient learners. An investigation of such repair patterns can contribute to our understanding of the conditions, forms and efficiency of learner-native speaker communication.

In order to tackle the problem of repair behaviour as dependent on learners' proficiency level, we adopted a procedure which can be characterized as deductive-inductive hypothesis formation: predictions were established on the basis of theoretical considerations and an analysis of a small data set. As a theoretical framework, the four repair structures set up by Schegloff/ Jefferson/Sacks (1977) are used (see above). However, because of the asymmetric distribution of linguistic knowledge, it has been necessary to observe a distinction between the self = the learner and the self = the native speaker. The result of this is that there are not four but eight types of repair sequences to be considered. The data basis consists of six conversations between the same native speaker of English and six Danish learners of three different proficiency levels: two grade 6 pupils, representing the beginners' level; two grade 10 pupils from different streams ('folkeskole' and 'gymnasium'), representing the intermediate level; one student from a college of education and one university student of English, representing the advanced level (see Færch 1979 for a description of the comprehensive data collection from which these conversations were selected).

4.2.1. Learner self-initiated self-repair

There should be a strong need for self-repair on the part of **beginning learners,** which will however be difficult to realize precisely because of their lack of proficiency. This conflict manifests itself in the data in there being very little self-repair at this level. The few instances regularly involve language switch either in the repairable or the completion as in (1).

(1) L: 'hun' sche --- 'bliver'

[*hun* = 'she', *bliver* = 'become']

With **intermediate learners,** the need for self-repair will still be fairly strong, and it should now be matched by sufficient ability to self-repair. The primary motive for self-repair is functional, i.e. the learner experiences a mismatch between his communicative intention and the linguistic means by which he realized it in the first place. Such functional repairs include specifications:

(2) L: I was er driving a bike – er – motorbike

In the majority of functional self-repairs at this level, the repairable is a product of the communication strategy of language switch, i.e. a Danish lexical item.

(3) L: I don't feel it's er – the right class er – you haven't got the – eeerm – 'sammenhold' – eer – well you – you haven't er – it very good good together [N:mm] you are split up in – in a small er groups

[*sammenhold* = 'group feeling']

The occurrence of formal self-repairs will depend both on the learner's formal linguistic proficiency and the extent to which he self-monitors his performance. For instance, out of the eight self-repairs performed by our gymnasium learner, only one is a formal repair:

(4) N: do people not worry – I mean when there – are so few jobs – available

L: (clicks tongue) [N:mm] well we talked about – 'eller' talks – talk about it – but er – not very often

[*eller* = 'or']

Advanced learners should have little need to initiate self-repair as far as the comprehensibility of their utterances is concerned, while at the same time their ability for self-repairing is high. Whether or not they self-repair is therefore not so much determined by an 'objective' need for repair as by what they consider appropriate communicative behaviour on their part. Accordingly, we find fewer **functional** repairs, most of which are motivated by unsatisfactory word choices, and even fewer repairables involve language switch. In fact, our university student's self-initiated self-repairs do not include a Danish trouble source at all. The extent to which advanced learners identify and decide to self-repair on **formal** trouble sources will primarily depend on their level of linguistic aspiration, which might in turn be a function of their need for defensive face-saving. Both factors will determine how

much the learner self-monitors his speech for formal correctness. Furthermore, if the learners were/are exposed to a type of foreign language teaching which puts a strong emphasis on formal correctness, this might encourage them to self-monitor and self-repair a lot. These factors seem to operate in the cases of our advanced learners, with whom formally motivated self-initiated self-repair is the most frequently occurring repair pattern. In particular the university student shows clear indications of embarrassment at her formal faux pas:

(5) L: no it's it's also something with erm economy to [N: mm] do (looking concentratedly in front of herself, speaking overdistinctly at reduced speed:) it has something to do with economy

4.2.2. Native speaker self-initiated self-repairs

At the **elementary** level, one might hypothesize that the native speaker's need for self-repairing is inversely proportionate to the degree to which she simplifies her speech. Native speakers who do not reduce very much lexically or syntactically have to other-monitor extensively and self-repair.

The native speaker involved in the six conversations clearly prefers not to simplify formally but self-repairs instead. At the elementary level, this type is so frequent that it accounts for one half of all the repair sequences we have identified. The native speaker's self-repairs all aim at 'explicitizing' what she is trying to communicate. And as nearly all the native speaker's turns are questions, it is not surprising that many of the repairs involve the formulation of a question (typically a **wh**-question) in a more explicit or concrete way (often a **yes/no** question):

(6) N: what – do you do – you do English
L: yes

Another highly frequent type of repair at this level involves referential aspects, typically with respect to lexical items but occasionally also referential problems caused by the native speaker's use of pronominalization and ellipsis:

(7) N: perhaps one day – maybe they'll come mm
L: 'ja'

(8) N: do you do that at school as well – er at school – d'you make pictures
L: no

With both learners at the elementary level we find a special variant of native speaker self-initiated self-repair, occurring with a learner reply or uptaker **between** the trouble source and the repair:

(9) (talking about football)
N: are they good
L: yes they can
N: are they good at football
L: yes

In this example, the learner's first reply is not coherent with the native speaker's first question, which may have caused the native speaker to self-repair even when the learner has apparently used an appropriate reply/uptaker:

(10) N: Ballerup – [L: yes] is that a long way from here
L: yes –
N: lots of kilometres – ...

On the basis of examples like this we hypothesize that at the elementary level, the native speaker is uncertain how to assess the learner's replies and uptakers in general: there is a need for double-checking.

At the **intermediate** level we would expect to find the same types of native speaker self-repairs as at the elementary level, although the need for self-repairing (caused by the learner's limited receptive competence) should be reduced. This is borne out by the two conversations at this level: the native speaker's self-repairs 'explicitize' (mostly lexical items), and they amount to less than a third of all the repair-sequences in the two conversations.

It is worth mentioning that at this level we find no examples of the native speaker self-repairing **after** a reply or an uptaker. We assume that at this level the native speaker has sufficient confidence in the learner's ability to reply/uptake appropriately.

Finally, the need for the native speaker to self-repair at the **advanced** level should be slight as learners at this level have acquired almost native-like listening comprehension. The few cases we find of the native speaker self-repairing are triggered off by the learner not taking her turn at the appropriate point in the discourse:

(11) N: do you have to do sciences – as well
L: (no reaction)
N: er physics and math and ...

4.2.3. Learner other-initiated self-repairs

At the **elementary** level, there is a strong need for repairing on the learner's turns, but as it can be hypothesized that elementary learners are not very good at assessing when their contribution to the interaction necessitates a repair, the initiative for initiating repair remains with the native speaker. As she is aware of the learner's limited ability to complete the repair, the result is that the native speaker prefers to complete the repair herself (see below). This hypothesis is supported by the two conversations at the elementary level in which we find only 3 learner other-initiated self-completed repairs but 23 learner other-initiated other-completed repairs.

As there is still a strong need for repairing on the learners' performance at the **intermediate** level, and as the learners' ability to complete repairs is higher, we would expect to find more other-initiated self-completed repairs at this level than at either the lower or the higher level. This is what we find in the conversations, as exemplified with the following:

(12) N: have you been outside Denmark
(...)
L: ('ʃa: tə)
N: (appeals non-verbally)
L: **char**ter tours

At the advanced level the need for the native speaker to request a repair on an item in the learner's performance is generally low. If the need should

arise at this level, one might expect a preference for this repair type rather than for other-completion, following the general preference for self-correction in native speaker – native speaker interactions. In our conversations, the university student is requested to self-repair three times, whereas the native speaker only other-repairs once (see below):

(13) L: we share the apartment (...)
it's er has four and a half no rubbish three and a half room
N: what's half a room
L: (giggles) it's a small room

4.2.4. Native speaker other-initiated self-repairs

One might expect considerable need for **beginning learners** to initiate repairs in the native speaker's performance, due to problems in listening comprehension. However, whether this prediction actually bears out depends at least on the following variables: (a) the native speaker's use of foreigner talk; (b) her use of self-initiated and self-completed repairs; (c) the learner's decision as to 'reduce' or 'achieve' communicative goals in the ongoing discourse. Our native speaker, while not using foreigner talk, performs lots of self-initiated self-repairs when conversing with the beginning learners – this constitutes in fact the largest repair class at this level (see above). Furthermore, our beginning learners can clearly be characterized as reducers: they abandon a communicative goal as soon as a receptive or productive problem arises, rather than work out a solution which allows them to maintain the goal. There are therefore very few occurrences of this repair pattern in the beginners' performance, one of which is the following:

(14) N: do you do any games
L: games
N: games – do you play anything other than football

At the **intermediate level**, the learners' receptive skills are certainly better but still not sufficiently well developed in order for them to do without initiating native speaker self-repairs. Again, the degree to which the native

speaker adjusts her performance to her interlocutor's proficiency level and the learner's decision to reduce or achive will determine the occurrence of this repair type. Our gymnasium learner, for instance, is very much of an 'achiever', being actively involved and apparently genuinely interested in the conversation. The native speaker uses unreduced English on her and self-initiates a self-repair only once. It is therefore not surprising that the learner runs into comprehension problems occasionally and requests repairs from the native speaker. The majority of the trouble sources involve a lexical item or a collocation. The learner initiates the repair by using an unspecific non-verbal (looking appealingly) or verbal repair request (*what, pardon, hvad behager*), or a re-present with rising intonation. In completing the repair, the native speaker makes use of various completion formats, whose choice depends both on the specificity of the learner's repair initiator and the native speaker's assessment as to what the trouble source might be. (15) illustrates how the native speaker in reaction to the learner's first unspecific repair requests simply repeats her utterance, whereas the learner's subsequent specific repair initiation (a re-present) gives a clear indication of the trouble source, which the native speaker then repairs on by using a paraphrase.

(15) N: do you often perform out –
L: er (visual appeal)
N: perform
N: do you often go out and put on your show –
in other places

Due to their high receptive proficiency, **advanced learners** should have little need for initiating self-repairs from the native speaker. However, this effect might be counterbalanced to some extent if their comprehension task is made more difficult by more complex input from the native speaker. Moreover, face-saving will probably play a more important role at this level: the learners might be more reluctant to admit ignorance by initiating a repair from their native interlocutor. The effect of this psychological variable can possibly account for the difference in occurrence of this repair pattern in the conversations with the two advanced learners: whereas the student from the college of education, who does not seem to experience the native speaker's linguistic superiority as face-threatening, freely initiates self-repairs from her

interlocutor, the more ambitious university student refrains from doing so completely – even in cases where she quite obviously did not understand the native speaker's utterance as in (16).

(16) L: - - - and then he can read on er continue reading [N: mm] erm something called 'cand. merc.' erm
N: that's a kind of degree isn't it
L: no no
N: isn't it
L: no it's it's something with erm economy [N: mm] to do (*cand.merc.* = degree in commerce)

4.2.5. Learner self-initiated other-repair

Again, the need for appealing to the native speaker for assistance chould be inversely proportionate to the learner's proficiency level, but reduction rather than achievement behaviour might overrule this need at the **beginning level**. As our beginners have a strong tendency to reduce their communicative goal when they encounter linguistic problems, it is consistent with their overall communicative behaviour that each of them appeals for assistance only once during the whole discourse.

The same holds true for the **intermediate learners**, where the 10th former, a 'reducer', appeals just once, whereas the gymnasium student, an 'achiever', appeals more often in order to elicit a lexical item from the native speaker which is not part of her repertoire. All of her appeals are combined with non-cooperative communication strategies, and the native speaker's repair completion is regularly taken up by a receipt or a re-present of the substituted item:

(17) L: he should sail [N: mm] he is a sails – man – 'nej' no
N: sailor
L: sailor – salesman that's something else

At the **advanced level**, there should be little need for appeals, due to the learners' high productive competence. The actual occurrence of self-initiated

other-repairs may be reduced even further if learners are concerned about defensive face-saving. However, the few instances in our data indicate occasional productive problems even at the advanced level. Again, the difference in face-saving behaviour can account for the higher occurrence of self-initiated other-repairs in the college of education student's conversation compared to the university student's, and is paralleled by their initiations of native speakers' self-repairs, as mentioned above. As in the case of the gymnasium learner, the repairable produced by the college of education student involves a lexical problem which she attempts to solve by means of both uncooperative and cooperative communication strategies, and the repair completion provided by the native speaker is followed up by a re-present.

(18) L: I think it's – it has been – rather good that she came into a – new [N: mm] 'børnehave' children's institution [N: mm] I don't know what it's called
N: er er I we call them kindergartens
L: kindergarten
N: yeah
L: yes
(*børnehave* = "kindergarten")

4.2.6. Native speaker self-initiated other-repairs

Although this repair type might be expected at the advanced level, this being closest to interactional norms holding for native speaker-native speaker conversation, the situation even at this level is too asymmetric for the native speaker to elicit an other-repair. In all the six conversations, there is not a single occurrence of a native speaker self-initiated other repair.

4.2.7. Learner other-initiated other-repair

This repair-type has already been dealt with indirectly above in connection with learner other-initiated self-repair, and we shall briefly repeat out hypotheses here: At the **elementary** levels there is a strong need for other-initiation

of repair, and as the native speaker does not expect the learner to be able to self-repair, the result is that the native speaker completes the repair herself. This is typically done by means of a repetition of (part of) the learner's turn including a (suggested) correction of the trouble source. In most cases, the native speaker's repair completion is then followed up by the learner:

(19) L: I have 'selv'
N: you have it yourself
L: 'ja'

This way of repairing on a trouble-source in the learner's performance is by far the most common at the elementary level (23 repair sequences out of 36 sequences in all dealing with problems located in the learners' performance belonged to this type).

At the **intermediate** level, there is less need for the native speaker to make use of this type of repair, which is potentially face-threatening. The repair typically has the function of a repair suggest, to be followed up by the learner.

Finally, at the **advanced** level we would expect to find very few cases of learner other-initiated other-repairs, and examples are in fact hard to find in the conversations.

4.2.8. Native speaker other initiated other-repairs

This repair type should be rare at all levels: the **beginning learners** will have a considerable need for initiating, but hardly the proficiency to complete a repair on a trouble source produced by the native speaker. **Advanced learners**, on the other hand, should have few comprehension problems which make the initiation of a repair necessary, and in the instances where they do, they will probably leave it to the native speaker to complete the repair, thereby observing face-saving conventions according to which native speaking participants organize their repair behaviour. Because of this, the occasional other-initiated other-repairs performed by advanced learners are most likely to have the form of a repair suggest, which requires confirmation by the native interlocutor.

(20) N: do you know this city very well
L: Copenhagen
N: yeah

In our data, native speakers' other-initiated other-repairs occur only once in each of the conversations with the beginning and advanced learners, and not at all in the intermediate learners' conversations.

5. Concluding remarks

As can be seen from the hypotheses we have just established, only one type of repairables has been considered, namely repairables due to linguistic code problems. The reason for this 'preference' for metalingual repair work is that the six data sets analysed contain no single occurrence of metacommunicative repairs, i.e. repairs directed towards the illocutionary force of utterances. This is undoubtedly a consequence of the fixed discourse structure of the conversations, which is almost invariably question-answer-follow-up with a strong tendency for the native speaker to perform the questions and the follow-up moves (cf. Holmen 1981 for a discussion of the discourse structure of the PIF conversations). One **might** therefore hypothesize that other types of conversational data between learners and native speakers would exhibit a more extensive use of the metacommunicative function. However, we do not consider this hypothesis very likely and for the following reasons. Making use of the metalingual function is intimately related to the social role of being a foreigner, which means that there is little reason for defensive face-saving if the learner accepts this special role (cf. Harder 1980 for a discussion of the 'reduced personality' of the foreign language learner). We therefore believe that pragmatic flaws are potentially more threatening for the learner's face as a communicator in general, independently of whether he communicates by means of his native or a foreign language, than are grammatical, lexical and propositional flaws.

In section 2, we discussed the relationship between repairs and uptaking, thereby highlighting an area of overlap between the metalingual/metacommunicative and the phatic function. It will be an interesting research task to find out how other types of discourse regulation and the means through

which they are performed tie in with repairs. The following preliminary assumptions can be made:

Turntaking takes place when the former hearer initiates a self-repair or an other-repair on the former speaker's utterance; compare

S1: 'she wants to study archeology'
S2: 'are you sure it is archeology?'
S1: 'no I meant anthropology'; or

S1: 'she wants to study archeology'
S2: 'you mean anthropology'
S1: 'yes you're right'.

Note that in both examples, the assumption behind the initiation of a repair by S2, viz. that S1 produced a repairable, is confirmed by S1 (in the first instance by means of a self-repair, in the second through a follow-up move subsequent to the other-repair). However, one might also wish to include cases in the repair system where the assumed repairable turns out to be an adequately chosen item: thus S1 in the above examples might confirm his original choice, or reject S2's repair suggest; compare

S1: 'she wants to study archeology'
S2: 'are you sure it is archeology?'
S1: 'yes I'm positive'.

S1: 'she wants to study archeology'
S2: 'you mean anthropology'
S1: 'no I did mean archeology'.

As both the function and the structure of such check sequences are very similar to the earlier mentioned cases which included a 'true' repairable, one might decide to incorporate them into the repair system. As regards the relationship between turntaking and other-initiation of repair, a question to be looked at is whether turntaking in such cases is performed by means of a gambit, which then probably not only has a discourse-regulating (phatic)

but also a mitigating (modal) function, or whether turntaking gambits are 'deleted' if the floor is claimed for repair purposes:

S1: 'she wants to study archeology'
S2: 'well are you sure you mean archeology?'.

There is a clear link between repair and **turnkeeping** in that turnkeeping gambits often provide the time necessary for planning a self-completion of a repair, e.g. in

'I can't find the screwdriver – no – what's it called – er – erm – I mean the wrench'.

Turnkeeping gambits are utilized in such instances in order to observe the interactional preference for self-repair. A problem to be considered could be how long a period of time speakers are allowed to use for self-completing a repair or, put differently, how long co-participants are prepared to delay an other-completion. A specification of the parameters which govern the possible length of turnkeeping for self-repair completion may be useful.

Turngiving can be performed by means of a check for a confirmation or correction, or to self-initiate an other-repair, for example

S1. 'and then he asked me where I'd put the – er – type – writer – is that what you call it?'
S2: 'yes type-writer'

S1. 'and then he asked me where I'd put the – er – writing – machine – is that what you call it?'
S2. 'we say type-writer'

S1. 'and then he asked me where I'd put the – er – what do you call it the machine one uses for writing'.

Structurally, all self-initiated checks or other-completed repairs involve turngiving, just as all other-initiation of repair involves turntaking. Yet the other-initiations listed above differ in their presuppositions: In the first and

second example, S1 has a hypothesis about the lexical item by means of which he can express his intended concept (whether the hypothesis is correct or false in terms of L2 is irrelevant from S1's perspective), whereas he has no such hypothesis in the third example, where he has to paraphrase the intended concept. If one pursues the direction indicated by these observations, one has to go beyond discourse analysis proper and adopt a psycholinguistic perspective. This shift of perspective ties up with an issue discussed earlier in this paper (see section 3. above), viz. the relationship between descriptive and explanatory approaches to repair work.

In discussing the repair framework established by Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks we noted that very little attempt was made by them to **explain** the preference for self-repair except in terms of the discourse structure itself, and we suggested that the concept of face might be relevant for such explanation. We referred to face work occasionally in our hypotheses about the occurrence of the various repair types at the three levels of proficiency, but apart from such sporadic explanatory notes we have not attempted to set up hypotheses of an explanatory character in the paper. We would like to finish off the article by briefly considering what questions could be pursued in throwing more light on why learners and native speakers should opt for specific repair types in specific interactional situations.

As for the **native speakers** the distinction mentioned by Ferguson (1977) between linguistic simplification and 'clarifying modification of speech' (including self-repairs) seems of relevance here. If the native speaker decides not to simplify linguistically there will be an increased need for metalingual and metacommunicative activity. We need to know more about what principles can account for the native speaker's choice of one or the other type of simplification and, given the latter type (repair work), what are the relevant behavioural features in the learner for the native speaker to decide that repair work is needed or has been successfully completed.

The **learners**' repair behaviour is probably best explained as a product of transfer from communicating in their L1 and transfer from the foreign language classroom, in the way that their knowledge of the different repair types is based on transfer from L1 communication and their preferences for specific repair types is conditioned by the interactional structure of the classrooms in which they have learnt their English (cf. Færch/Kasper 1982 for a more detailed discussion of 'procedural knowledge' in L1 and inter-

language). What one would like to investigate are therefore questions like the following: to what extent are learners encouraged to self-monitor and other-monitor their performance by their teacher? to what extent does the teacher self-repair rather than encourage the pupils to make use of inferencing procedures or – it these fail – request a repair? Furthermore, if the teacher relies on the pupils to initiate repairs, does this happen simply by the pupils not reacting to a teacher question (lack of uptaking) or does he encourage them to elicit **specific** types of repair (cf. Færch 1981 for a discussion of inferencing procedures and different types of repair requests in lexical interpretation)?

REFERENCES

Brown, Penelope, Stephen Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. Questions and politeness. Strategies in social interaction, ed. by Esther N. Goody, 56-289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duncan, Starkey Jr. 1974. On the nature of speaker-auditor interaction during speaking turns. Language and Society 3. 161-180.

Edmondson, Willis. 1977. Gambits in foreign language teaching. Kongressdokumentation der 7. Arbeitstagung der Fremdsprachendidaktiker Giessen 1976, ed. by Herbert Christ and Hans-Eberhard Piepho. 47-49. Limburg: Frankonius.

Edmondson, Willis, Juliane House. 1981. Let's talk and talk about it. A pedagogic interactional grammar of English. München: Urban und Schwarzenberg.

Færch, Claus. 1979. Research in foreign language pedagogy – the PIF project (= Anglica et Americana 7). Department of English, University of Copenhagen.

Færch, Claus. 1981. Inferencing procedures and communication strategies in lexical comprehension. Paper presented at the BAAL Seminar 'Interpretive Strategies', Lancaster, September 1981.

Færch, Claus, Gabriele Kasper. 1980. Processes and strategies in foreign language learning. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht 5, 47-118.

Færch, Claus, Gabriele Kasper. In press. Ja und – og hvad så? A contrastive discourse analysis of gambits in German and Danish. Contrastive Linguistics, ed. by Jacek Fisiak. The Hague: Mouton.

Færch, Claus, Gabriele Kasper. Forthcoming. On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. Strategies in interlanguage communication, ed. by Claus Færch and Gabriele Kasper. London: Longman.

Færch, Claus, Gabriele Kasper. 1982. Procedural knowledge as a component of learners' communicative competence. Copenhagen and Århus. Mimeo.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1977. Baby talk as a simplified register. Talking to children: Language input and acquisition, ed. by Catherine E. Snow and Charles A. Ferguson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaskill, William H. 1980. Correction in native speaker – nonnative speaker conversation, ed. by Larsen-Freeman 1980, 125-137.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to-face behavior. New York: Anchor Books.

Harder, Peter. 1980. Discourse as self-expression – on the reduced personality of the second-language learner. Applied Linguistics 1 (1980), 262-270.

Heritage, John. 1981. Demonstrations of understanding. Paper presented at the BAAL Seminar 'Interpretive Strategies', Lancaster, September 1981.

Holmen, Anne. 1981. Discourse analysis of learner – native speaker interaction with learners from grades 10 and 12. Paper presented at the Sixth International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Lund, August 1981.

House, Juliane. 1980. Gambits in deutschen und englischen Alltagsdialogen. Versuch einer pragmatisch-kontrastiven Analyse. Sprache und Verstehen, ed. by Wolfgang Kühlwein and Albert Raasch, Bd. II, 101-108. Tübingen: Narr.

Jakobson, Roman. 1960. Linguistics and poetics. Style in language, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok. 350-373. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press and Wiley.

Kasper, Gabriele. 1981. Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache. Eine Untersuchung des Englischen fortgeschrittener deutscher Lerner. Tübingen: Narr.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1981. Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane (ed.) 1980. Discourse analysis in second language research. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Rehbein, Jochen. 1978. Reparative Handlungsmuster und ihre Verwendung im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Bochum: Mimeo.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language 53, 361-382.

Schwartz, Joan. 1980. The negotiation of meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English, in Larsen-Freeman 1980, 138-153.

Tarone, Elaine. 1980. Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. Language Learning 30, 417-431.

Watzlawichk, Paul, Janet H. Beavin, Don D. Jackson. 1967. Pragmatics of human communication. New York: Norton.